



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/047,244	01/14/2002	Juho Jumppanen	15208	5900

7590 07/03/2002  
SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER  
400 Garden City Paza  
Garden City, NY 11530

EXAMINER

MENON, KRISHNAN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1723

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2002

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s) <b>JF-5</b>	
	10/047,244	JUMPPANEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Krishnan S Menon	1723	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>4</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP(H6-227994) in view of Reznik (US 6,383,543)

JP(994) discloses a process for separating essential oils comprising steam distillation (page 3, Para 0001) to a mixture containing essential oils and water, contacting with divinyl benzene polystyrene adsorbent or activated carbon, and then desorbing the essential oils (page 3, para 0001). The water (hydrophilic phase) temperature is at 60° C (page 8, para 0020); the hydrophobic adsorbent is synthetic polymer – divinyl benzene cross-linked-polystyrene, activated carbon, etc. (page 8: 0016,0017); material is Cyprus (page 3: claim 2); Cyprus or yellow oils (page 11: 0030); and the process is continuous (page 11: 0029).

JP (994) is silent on recycling the hydrophilic solvent, water as in claim 1 of the instant application. However, JP (994) states conserving water (solvent) as one of the advantages of the process. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to recycle the water used in the process. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention could chose to recycle water in the process which is a standard practice in the industry to recycle solvents in extraction/distillation processes.

JP(994) also is silent on the word 'chromatography' as the process even if JP(994) describes adsorption and then eluting/desorbing with another solvent as in chromatography, as in claim 8 of the instant application; and does not teach separating Orris oil to myristic acid and irone, as in claim 9 of the instant application. Reznik (543) teaches chromatography as the means for separating the components of essential oils from rosemary and similar plants (col 5: 18-26). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to chose the teachings of Reznik (543) and make a chromatographic column to separate the essential oils and further fractionate the essential oils from Orris to its components, using the process of JP(994) teachings. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention could chose the Reznik (543) method with the JP(994) processing for chromatographic separation of essential oil in to components as alternate but equivalent process affording equivalent results.

### *Conclusion*

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

1. Mastelic; Kem Ind, 30 (5) 249-252 (1981): Steam distillation and activated carbon adsorption for essential oil process; including recycle of process water.

Art Unit: 1723


2. JP (Kokai-60-115699): hop essential oil recovery by steam distillation followed by adsorption and desorption.
3. Jain (US 5,955,084): chromatographic separation of components of essential oils;
4. Machale (J. Chem. Tech. Biotechnol., 1997, 69, 362-366): chromatographic separation of essential oil components
5. Chromecek (US 4,962,133) polymeric adsorbent media for essential oils
6. Todd (US 4,877,635) Extraction of essential oils

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krishnan S Menon whose telephone number is 703-305-5999. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda L Walker can be reached on 703-308-0457. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Krishnan S. Menon  
Patent Examiner  
June 26, 2002

  
W. L. WALKER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700